September 24, 1951

SUBJECT: Megotiations in Paris between ARRANCHIK, President of the Melorussian National Rada (ME) and KERENSKI representing the Council for Liberation of the Peoples of Russia.

1. Relations between Great Russians and Historussians.

The recognition of the Effelorussian people as an independent people and negotiation with them as equals are the developments which proved particularly gratifying to Abrastchik. That alone, he pointed out, is a tremendous step forward since his conversations with Kerenski were the first occasion in 30 years when Great Russian and Effelorussian exciles had conducted serious political negotiations. He expressed himself particularly satisfied that no publicity had so far been given to the program approved by the Council. He saw in this discretion another indication of political wisdom since he was given to understand by Kerenski that it was a step decided by the Council with a view to make it possible to amend the program should this be desired by the representatives of the other peoples invited to join the sovement.

While Kerenski refrained from reading the program to Abrastchik, various problems relating thereto were discussed during the conversations. There is no doubt, according to Abrastchik, that points such as "collaboration for struggle against Bolshovium" would meet with the wholesale approval of the Réclorussian exiles. Other points, among them the title of the organization, found Abrastchik less responsive. He declared, however, that a change in the title could possibly be introduced by means of negotiation. He is willing to concede to the Great Russians that they are not responsible for Bolshevism and its policies, but insists that the Rada be admitted to the Council as representing an independent Béslorussian state, and that the question of the ultimate fate of Béslorussia, whether it should be an independent

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3 B Z B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2004 2005

country or an integral part of Russia, be postponed until the liberation of Byelorussian territories and the holding of a plebiscite. (Privately, in his conversations with Embassy officials, Abramtchik has expressed the views that he does not believe total independence of any country in Eastern Turope to be possible after its liberation, but that all countries would be federated in one unit in accordance with political trends now popular in the West of Europe.)

One of the most important problems treated during the inter-Views between Kerenski and Abremtchik pertains to the borders of Brelgrussia. In this connection, Abramtchik raised the question of the Council's actual views on the subject. He said that Kerenski had made no specific statement with regard to the territories inhabited by Bielorussians, while SOLOVIEV in conversations with Dr. STANKEVIC, a Byelorussian representative in Germany, had limited the field to "territories occupied by the Soviet Union in 1939". Such limitations are considered with disfavor by Abramtchik, who sees therein an attempt to transform the Melorussian question into an internal Russian affair. (In this connection, Abramtchik expressed his regret that negotiations with Sfelorussian representatives were conducted simultaneously by several Council representatives and his hope that in the future following his complaints on the subject to Kerenski, these conversations would be carried on by one duly authorized person only.) In the opinion of Abramtchik, the question of borders should be left open and extremely vague, as was done by the Poles who recognized Sylcrussia de jure (by writing a letter to Abramtchik addressed to him as the Fresident of the Bieloruseian Rada), but refrained from concluding an agreement concerning its borders.

2. Approval of Council and adherence thereto by Melorussian exiles.

In his conversations with Kerenski, Abramtchik cautioned him against rashness and excessive speed. The Etelorussian exiles had been subjected to anti-Russian propaganda for many years and one false step in attempting to bring the two groups of exiles together might bring catastrophe. He pointed out that he could not sign any agreement with the Council or give his oral support thereto without first obtaining the necessary authority from the Fada. Otherwise, he would be considered a traitor to the Bielorussian cause and would probably be compelled to resign from the Rada.

Abramtchik outlined his plans in dealing with this question as follows: in October, he will discuss the possibility of cooperating with the Council with the dislorussian exiles in Paris, Belgium, and England. He will then call together the Sixth Session of the Rada, which was to have met in December, 1951, in the United States, but which he will convoke instead for November, 1951, and will request the Rada, the members of which are for the most part residents of the United States (70 members of a total of 120 in exits, and a former total of 160), for authority to adhere to the Council should the latter accept the conditions presented by the Efelorussians.

3. Mielorussian representation at the next meeting of the Council.

Abrantchik turned down the suggestion of Kerenski to attend as a representative of Efelorussia the Council's meeting in late September or early October, 1951. His presence at the meeting could give rise to misunderstanding and might cause unfavorable comment on the part of the Efelorussians, since he was the President of the National Rada. He agreed, however, to appoint two Efelorussian representatives to the meeting in the capacity of observers, but refused Kerenski's request that these representatives act as spokesmen for the Efelorussians on the grounds that they lacked sufficient authority and could note complications by a mis-statement of Efelorussian views. The observers whom Abrantchik plans to delegate to the meeting both reside in Germany. They are Ir. Stanislas STANKEVIC And BORTNIK, editor of BATKOVSHCHINA, a Bislorussian publication appearing in Germany.